

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, 10, and 12-15 are pending in this Application.

By this Amendment, claims 1, 7, 9, 13, and 15 are currently amended. Claims 6 and 14 have been canceled. Applicants respectfully submit that support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the specification and the drawings.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 15 remain pending in the Application after entry of this Amendment. No new matter has been entered.

In the Office Action, claim 9 stands objected to due to one or more misspellings. Claims 1, 9, 12, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite. Claims 1, 3, 5, 9, 12, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,096,220 (hereinafter “Seibel”), in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0077998 (hereinafter “Andrews”), and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,096,220 (hereinafter “Cook”). Claims 6, 7, 10, 14, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seibel, Andrews, Cook, and U.S. Patent No. 6,014,664 (hereinafter “Fagin”).

#### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S. C. § 103(a)**

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, 10, and 12-15 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Seibel, Andrews, Cook, and Fagin. Applicants respectfully submit that Seibel, Andrews, Cook, and Fagin, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose one or more of the claim limitations recited in each of claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, 10, and 12-15. These differences, along with other differences, establish that the subject matter as a whole of claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, 10, and 12-15 would not have been obvious at the time of invention to a person of ordinary skill in the art.

For example, Applicants respectfully submit that Seibel, Andrews, Cook, and Fagin, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the limitation recited in amended claim 1 of “executing, with the computer system, the plurality of rules on the mapped data to produce a set of analyzed data, the set of analyzed data including the score for each potential sales lead indicating the individual quality of each potential sales lead in the first group

of potential sales leads.” As recited, a plurality of rules are provided by a user via a graphical user interface that operate on a plurality of attributes of a user-defined data format to assess an individual quality of each individual potential sales lead in the first group of sales leads. As recited, each rule defines at least one attribute, an expression, and a value to be added or subtracted to a score representing the individual quality of each potential sales lead based on an evaluation of the data associated with the sales leads stored in the data source corresponding to the at least one attribute with the expression.

In one example, FIG. 4 of the Application illustrates a graphical user interface through which a user may define rules. FIG. 4 illustrates that a user has selected attributes for “FIRST\_NAME,” “EMAIL\_ADDRESS,” and “LAST\_NAME.” FIG. 4 further illustrates that the user may provide an expression for each attribute. Various types of expressions may be used. FIG. 4 further illustrates that a user can provide a score for each attribute. The Application teaches in paragraph [0028] that the score defines a value that is added or subtracted to data quality assessment of each records (e.g., a score representing the individual quality of each potential sales lead). Accordingly, as recited in amended claim 1, each potential sales lead can receive a score based on its data when formatted according to the data format.

Yet, Seibel, Andrews, Cook, and Fagin, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest executing a plurality of rules on the mapped data to produce a set of analyzed data where the set of analyzed data includes a score for each potential sales lead indicating an individual quality of each potential sales lead in the first group of potential sales leads as recited in amended claim 1.

In particular, Seibel fails to disclose or suggest as recited in amended claim 1 that a user can define a plurality of rules for a data format where each rules defines at least one attribute, an expression, and a value to be added or subtracted to a score representing the individual quality of each potential sales lead based on an evaluation of the data associated with the sales leads stored in the data source corresponding to the at least one attribute with the expression. The Office Action alleges on page 4 that a user in Col. 2, lines 9-10 of Seibel can specify an attribute of a data format. The Office Action further alleges on page 4 that a user in Col. 2, lines 9-10 can specify an expression in that Seibel discloses “matching (type of test) the

attribute to the stored prospect's attributes.) However, while Seibel suggests a matching is performed, the Office Action fails to provide evidences that it is the user that provided information defining the matching expression as is recited in amended claim 1.

Furthermore, Seibel fails to disclose or suggest that the user provides a value to be added or subtracted to a score representing the individual quality of each potential sales lead based on an evaluation of the data associated with the sales leads stored in the data source corresponding to the at least one attribute with the expression as recited in amended claim 1. The Office Action's use of Andrew and Cook fail to cure the above discussed deficiencies of Siebel.

Moreover, the Office Action acknowledges on page 16 that Siebal, Andrews, and Cook fail to disclose scoring the mapped data as recited in claim 6 and alleges that Fagin discloses the recited limitation. However, Seibel, Andrews, Cook, and Fagin, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest that a user defines the rule to include a value to be added or subtracted to a score representing the individual quality of each potential sales lead based on an evaluation of the data associated with the sales leads stored in the data source corresponding to the at least one attribute with the expression as recited in amended claim 1. Yet, Fagin does not disclose that the user provides a value to be added or subtracted to a score representing the individual quality of each potential sales lead based on an evaluation of the data associated with the sales leads stored in the data source corresponding to the at least one attribute with the expression as recited in amended claim 1. Fagin merely suggests that the user can supply weights that represent coefficients applied to the attributes. The user-supplied weights weight (e.g., are multiplied to) the existing data values and are automatically applied and thus are different than a value to be added or subtracted to a score representing the individual quality of each potential sales lead based on an evaluation of the data associated with the sales leads stored in the data source corresponding to the at least one attribute with the expression as recited in amended claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that XX fails to disclose each and every claim limitation as recited in (amended) claim XX. Applicants further respectfully submit

that none of the cited references cure the above-discussed deficiencies of XX, and thus, (amended) claim XX is allowable over the cited references.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 9 and 13 are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claim 1, and others. Applicants respectfully submit that the dependent claims that depend directly and/or indirectly from independent claims 1, 9, and 13, are also allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of the independent claims. Applicants further respectfully submit that the dependent claims recite additional features that make the dependent claims allowable for additional reasons.

Unless otherwise specified, amendments to the claims are made for the purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof.

While Applicants do not necessarily agree with the prior art rejections set forth in the Office Action, these amendments may be made to expedite issuance of the Application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue claims to subject matter similar to those pending before the present Amendment in co-pending or subsequent applications.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean F. Parmenter, Reg. No. 53,437/  
Sean F. Parmenter  
Reg. No. 53,437

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 925-472-5000  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
SFP:lls  
62347350 v1